

Sri R. M. PATIL.—They belonged to the old Mysore State. Even if they are posted to Bellary, the rules of concession which were in force in the erstwhile Mysore State are applicable.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎ. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಈ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ ದರವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ 100, 50, 70 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಂತೆ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಡಾಕ್ಟರುಗಳಿಂದ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Not yet.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—Supposing we prove it. Will the Government then take action against such people who are trading on Government money?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—That is a hypothetical question. Apart from it, when the enquiries are made and when the Government is satisfied and if it is found under the guise of this, certainly Government has got long arms to take needful action.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Have any cases of misuse of the privilege been brought to the notice of Government?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I have stated, it is not yet known.

Unemployment due to prohibition.

Q.—471 Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM (Kolar Gold Fields).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether prohibition has resulted in mass unemployment to people engaged in liquor trade;

(b) if so, the number of them who were provided with alternative jobs and the number of them still in the waiting list?

A.—Sri MOHAMED ALI (Minister for Excise and Rural Industries).—

(a) No.

(b) Information is not available.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—The answer to (b) is: "Information is not available." Am I to presume from that answer that the answer to (a) is 'yes'?

Are the Government aware that 4,500 persons who are engaged in

liquor trade have submitted a memorandum stating that they are without job and seeking Government help for appointment?

*** Sri MOHAMED ALI.**—They are well-to-do and they have settled down in other occupations.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Has it come to the notice of Government that a large number of tappers in South Canara are without employment?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—This question does not relate to toddy tapping.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SHETTY.—With reference to the answer to (a), have the Government called for any statistics in this behalf?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—So far as the people engaged in liquor trade are concerned, it has not come to the notice of Government that they are unemployed.

Sri G. B. SHANKAR RAO.—Did the Government undertake to provide jobs to the people engaged in liquor trade?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—No.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಕುಡಿತ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ದಿನಕ್ಕೆ ಕ್ಕೂ ಗಳಲ್ಲ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಹೋಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಾ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—The actual information is not available.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—The question is specific and relates to dealers in liquor and not to other people.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—This is about unemployment of people engaged in liquor trade as a result of prohibition; not about tappers. If the Hon'ble Member wants information about tappers, he can put another question.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಈ ಸಮಾಚಾರವು ಜ್ಞಪ್ತವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಾ ಅಥವಾ ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಾ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—So far as replies to any specific question are concerned, we get the necessary information and if the Hon'ble Member wants further information not having a direct bearing on the question, he can put another question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He is asking whether you have made enquiries in this respect.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I am unable to say anything more.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಯೋಚಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ? ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಹೋಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರಬಹುದೆಂದು ತಾವು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I have not said that we have not made any enquiry. I have said that I am unable to say anything more about it.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—To question (a): whether prohibition has resulted in mass unemployment to people engaged in liquor trade, the answer is: "No". Then has it resulted in mass employment of people engaged in liquor trade ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not relevant here.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I leave it to the Chair.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ.—ಲಿಕ್ವರ್ ಟ್ರೇಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದವರು ತಮಗೆ ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲ, ಕೆಲಸ ಕೊಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆನಾದರೂ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ? ಅರ್ಜಿಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—No.

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO.—Was there a general survey made after the introduction of prohibition in the State about the number of tappers, contractors, etc.?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I want notice.

Sri F. H. MOHSIN.—While providing employment to the unemployed, will the Government consider the cases of those engaged in liquor trade ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—That will be considered.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Was it a part of the prohibition policy enunciated by Government; did they give any assurance to these people that in the event of their being unemployed, they would be given employment ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I have already answered that. No such guarantee was given.

Uniformity in the levy of Water Charge in Bangalore.

Q.—512. Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether they are aware of the difference in the minimum free allow-

ance of water allowed for domestic purpose and in the levy of excess water charges as in the City and Civil Area respectively ;

(b) the steps taken to bring uniformity and the stage at which the matter stand now ?

A.—Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Minister for Local Self-Government).—

(a) Yes.

(b) This is under consideration.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Am I correct in the presumption that the Hon'ble Minister for Local Self-Government and the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works did not agree with their opinions ?

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—That has nothing to do with this question.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Just now, that is, with reference to Question No. 1244, the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works said that differences were wiped out from 1st April 1956 with regard to the levy of water rate for the whole Corporation area. But in the answer to (a) of Question No. 512 whether there is difference in the minimum free allowance of water and in the levy of excess water charges between the City and Civil Area, it is stated as "Yes".

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Yes, there is that difference.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Let alone the minimum; I have also referred to the levy of excess water rate as between the City and Civil Station areas in my question No. 1244 and the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works has replied that such differences were removed from 1st April 1956; which answer is correct ?

(There was no answer)

Mr. SPEAKER.—The position is that if the Hon'ble Minister does not reply, the Chair cannot compel him to reply.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Can the Hon'ble Minister go on sitting without answering ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—If he has no answer to give he can sit.